UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,052	09/30/2003	Tatsuya Fujiyama	58799-096	2571

7590 02/06/2007

McDermott, Will & Emery
600, 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER	
PAN, JOSEPH T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/674,052	FUJIYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph Pan	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/30/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claim 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Referring to claim 12:

Claim 12 recites "A program product capable of being read by a computer for supporting creation of a security specification in respect of an information network system, which comprises: a definition information acceptance program that accepts definition information of respective components constituting the information network system from the user; a security specification selection program that looks up reusable examples from a security specification example database in which existing security specifications are registered as examples based on definition information of the component accepted by the definition information acceptance program in respect of the respective components; and a security specification draft creation program that creates a composite security specification draft in respect of an information network system by entering the details of respective examples found by the security specification selection unit in a prescribed form of security specification and accepts revisions of the draft from the user." A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, so the computer program itself is not a process. Therefore, a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program functionality, is treated as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. Therefore, claim 12 recites non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 12 objected to because of the following informalities:

"the security specification selection unit" is referred to, but not defined in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4 Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,132) in view of Sadiq (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0148183 A1).

Referring to claim 1:

i. Cheng teaches:

A security specification creation support device that supports creation of a security specification in respect of an information network system, comprising:

a security specification example database in which existing security specifications are registered as examples (see figure 1, element 14 'knowledge base'; and column 2, lines 41-51 of Cheng);

a definition information acceptance unit that accepts the definition information of respective components constituting the information network system from a user (see figure 10, element 29 'security model specifier'; and column 11, lines 52-64 of Cheng);

a security specification selection unit that looks up reusable examples from the security specification example database based on definition information of the component accepted by the definition information acceptance unit in respect of the respective components (see figure 1, element 15 'information scout'; and column 2, lines 52-63 of Cheng); and

a security specification draft creation unit that creates a composite security specification draft in respect of an information network system by entering the details of respective examples found by the security specification selection unit in a prescribed form of security specification and accepts revisions of the draft from the user (see figure 1, element 18 'program generator'; and column 2, lines 64-67 of Cheng).

Cheng discloses the security model specifier and the security model specification (see figure 10, element 29; column 11, lines 63-64 of Cheng). However, Cheng does not specifically mention the security specification.

ii. Sadiq teaches a method for customizing infrastructure services for use in network services, wherein Sadiq discloses the security specification (see page 5, paragraph [0074], lines 4-7 of Sadiq).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sadiq into the method of Cheng to apply the security specification.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Sadiq into the system of Cheng to apply the security specification, because Cheng's system utilizes the security model specifier and the security model specification (see figure 10, element 29; column 11, lines 63-64 of Cheng), therefore Sadiq's teaching of security specification would enhance Cheng's system.

Referring to claim 2:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose when at least one reusable example is detected from the security specification example database in respect of the respective components, allows a user to select an example for re-use (see column 2, lines 41-67 of Cheng); and when no reusable example detected from the example database, accepting from the user a specification draft of the components (see column 11, lines 26-30 of Cheng).

Referring to claim 3:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose that details of the security specification drafts of the respective components can be identified (see column 2, lines 60-63 of Cheng).

Referring to claim 4:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose dividing the information network system into operational environment units, such as domain, hosts [i.e., 'units'], and infrastructure services [i.e., 'subsystems'], etc. (see figure 5 of Sadiq).

Referring to claim 5:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose the prescribed form of security specification (see abstract, lines 1-3 'a system of property sheets', of Sadiq).

Referring to claim 6:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose the registering (see page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 9-11 of Sadiq).

Referring to claim 7:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose the configuration (see page 1, paragraph [0003] of Sadiq).

Referring to claims 8-10:

Change and Sadiq disclose the claimed subject matter: a security specification creation support device. They further disclose the tree structure and layer relationship (see figure 5; and page 8, paragraph [0113] of Sadiq).

Referring to claim 12:

i. Cheng teaches:

A program product capable of being read by a computer for supporting creation of a security specification in respect of an information network system, which comprises:

a definition information acceptance program that accepts the definition information of respective components constituting the information network system from the user (see figure 10, element 29 'security model specifier'; and column 11, lines 52-64 of Cheng);

a security specification selection program that looks up reusable examples from a security specification example database in which existing security specifications are registered as examples based on definition information of the component accepted by the definition information acceptance unit in respect of the respective components (see figure 1, element 15 'information scout'; and column 2, lines 52-63 of Cheng); and

a security specification draft creation program that creates a composite security specification draft in respect of an information network system by entering the details of respective examples found by the security specification selection unit in a prescribed form of security specification and accepts revisions of the draft from

the user (see figure 1, element 18 'program generator'; and column 2, lines 64-67 of Cheng).

Cheng discloses the security model specifier and the security model specification (see figure 10, element 29; column 11, lines 63-64 of Cheng). However, Cheng does not specifically mention the security specification.

ii. Sadiq teaches a method for customizing infrastructure services for use in network services, wherein Sadiq discloses the security specification (see page 5, paragraph [0074], lines 4-7 of Sadiq).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sadiq into the method of Cheng to apply the security specification.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Sadiq into the system of Cheng to apply the security specification, because Cheng's system utilizes the security model specifier and the security model specification (see figure 10, element 29; column 11, lines 63-64 of Cheng), therefore Sadiq's teaching of security specification would enhance Cheng's system.

Referring to claim 13:

i. Cheng teaches:

A security specification creation support method that supports creation of a security specification in respect of an information network system using a computer in which a security specification example database in which existing security specifications are registered as examples is stored in a storage device of the computer or another computer connected with the aforesaid computer through a network, and the computing device of the computer performs operations comprising:

Accepting from the user definition information of respective components constituting the information network system (see figure 10, element 29 'security model specifier'; and column 11, lines 52-64 of Cheng);

selecting a security specification by looking up reusable examples from the security specification example database based on definition information of the

component in respect of the respective components (see figure 1, element 15 'information scout'; and column 2, lines 52-63 of Cheng); and

creating a composite security specification draft in respect of the information network system by entering the detains of respective examples found by the security specification selection step in a prescribed form of security specification and accepting revisions of the draft in question are accepted from the user (see figure 1, element 18 'program generator'; and column 2, lines 64-67 of Cheng).

Cheng discloses the security model specifier and the security model specification (see figure 10, element 29; column 11, lines 63-64 of Cheng). However, Cheng does not specifically mention the security specification.

ii. Sadiq teaches a method for customizing infrastructure services for use in network services, wherein Sadiq discloses the security specification (see page 5, paragraph [0074], lines 4-7 of Sadiq).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sadiq into the method of Cheng to apply the security specification.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Sadiq into the system of Cheng to apply the security specification, because Cheng's system utilizes the security model specifier and the security model specification (see figure 10, element 29; column 11, lines 63-64 of Cheng), therefore Sadiq's teaching of security specification would enhance Cheng's system.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Pan whose telephone number is 571-272-5987.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Joseph Pan
January 30, 2007

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100